## PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

To:				WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORIT		
	see form	PCT/ISA/220				
				(PCT Rule 43bis.1)  Date of mailing (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)		
Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220				FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below		
_	national application l T/IB2004/002551	No.	International filing date 02.08.2004	(day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year) 07.08.2003	
B01 Appli	J2/16, B01D46/2	.4	JTOMATICHE S.P.A			
	This opinion co	ntains indicatio	ons relating to the fo	llowing items:		
	<ul> <li>Box No. I</li> <li>Box No. II</li> <li>Box No. III</li> <li>Box No. IV</li> <li>Box No. V</li> <li>Box No. VI</li> <li>Box No. VIII</li> <li>Box No. VIII</li> </ul>	Basis of the op Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; cit Certain docume Certain defects Certain observe	inion nent of opinion with reg f invention ement under Rule 43 <i>b</i> tations and explanation	gard to novelty, inverse is 1(a)(i) with regards supporting such supporting such such such such such such such such	ntive step and industrial applicability  to novelty, inventive step or industrial statement	
1.	Box No. I Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VII Box No. VIII FURTHER ACTI If a demand for inwritten opinion of the applicant cho	Basis of the op Priority Non-establishm Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; cit Certain docume Certain defects Certain observe  ON  International prelifithe International poses an Authorican under Rule	inion nent of opinion with reg f invention ement under Rule 43be tations and explanation ents cited in the international ap ations on the internation in Preliminary Examining ty other than this one t	gard to novelty, invents is 1(a)(i) with regard is supporting such s plication inal application ing Authority ("IPEA" to be the IPEA and the	to novelty, inventive step or industrial	
1.	Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VIII Box No. VIII FURTHER ACTI If a demand for in written opinion of the applicant cholenternational Burnwill not be so cor If this opinion is, submit to the IPE	Basis of the op Priority Non-establishm Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; cit Certain docume Certain defects Certain observe  ON International prelifithe International poses an Authori eau under Rule as provided about a written reply date of mailing of stater.	inion  nent of opinion with reg f invention ement under Rule 43be tations and explanation ents cited s in the international ap ations on the internation iminary examination is al Preliminary Examinin ty other than this one to 66.1 bis(b) that written eve, considered to be a y together, where apprent of Form PCT/ISA/220 of	gard to novelty, invents is 1(a)(i) with regard is supporting such a plication made, this opinion made, this opinion made in the IPEA and to opinions of this Inter written opinion of the opriate, with amend	to novelty, inventive step or industrial statement will usually be considered to be a ). However, this does not apply where he chosen IPEA has notifed the	

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office - Gitschiner Str. 103 D-10958 Berlin

Tel. +49 30 25901 - 0 Fax: +49 30 25901 - 840 Authorized Officer

Cubas Alcaraz, J

Telephone No. +49 30 25901-324



## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/IB2004/002551

	<del>"</del>						
	Box N	o. I Basis of the opinion					
1.	With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.						
	la	nis opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following inguage—, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search inder Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).					
2.	With reneces	egard to any <b>nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence</b> disclosed in the international application and sary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:					
	a. type	e of material:					
		a sequence listing					
		table(s) related to the sequence listing					
	b. format of material:						
		in written format					
		in computer readable form					
	c. time	e of filing/furnishing:					
		contained in the international application as filed.					
		filed together with the international application in computer readable form.					
		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.					
3.	h. C	addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto as been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional opies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as ppropriate, were furnished.					
4.	Additi	onal comments:					

10/567094

APPROC'OPCT/PTO 03 FEB 2013

International application No.
PCT/IB2004/002551

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

_	Box	No. II	Priority	0							
1.	$\boxtimes$										
		$\boxtimes$	copy of the earlier	application	n whose p	iority has been clain	ned (Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 66.7(a)).				
			translation of the e	arlier appl	ication wh	on whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).					
			•	-			e priority claim. This opinion has date is the claimed priority date.				
2.		This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.									
3.		It has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim because a copy of the priority document was not available to the ISA at the time that the search was conducted (Rule 17.1). This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.									
4.	Box	No. V		ment und		bis.1(a)(i) with reg	ard to novelty, inventive step or h statement				
1.	Stat	ement	•	,							
	Novelty (N)			Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-14					
	1 ( /			Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-14					
	Indu	ıstrial a <b>r</b>	oplicability (IA)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-14					

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

PCT/IB2004/002551

## Re Item V

1. The following document is referred to in this communication:

D1: US-A-5444892

2. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 is not inventive in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

Document D1 discloses a device for treating powdered material using a fluidized bed (see col. 1, lines 7-10). The device is provided with filters (see col 4, line 10-col. 7, line 11 and figures 1-3) in order to remove the entrained powder from the gas. The filters are cleaned using an auxiliary fluid provided by three different nozzles (references 20, 25 and 10 in the figures). During the cleaning operation, the filter is axially moved and rotated (see col. 6, line30-line 59), i.e. the filter changes its position while the nozzles remain in fixed positions.

The difference between the subject-matter of claim 1 and the disclosure of D1 is that the filter changes its angle with respect to the nozzles. It has to be pointed out that the wording of claim 1 ("...at least the first nozzles...", "...at least the second nozzles...") encompasses also the possility of having all nozzles working simultaneously. The effect of this movement is the extension of the cleaning operation to the outer walls of the filter. However, such an effect is present too in the device according to D1. Thus, the selection of the movement of the filter in order to change the angle of the filter with respect to the nozzles can only be seen as an arbritary choice not linked to any unexpected technical effect and being therefore obvious for the skilled person.

3. Dependent claims 2-14 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).